

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 409

AC 010 617

AUTHOR Wilson, Thomas W.  
TITLE A Survey of Pre and Post Retirement Programs Offered  
by Major Employers of Metropolitan Chicago.  
INSTITUTION Chicago Dept. of Human Resources, Ill.  
PUB DATE Mar 71  
NOTE 102p.  
  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58  
DESCRIPTORS \*Employer Attitudes; \*Industrial Relations; \*Labor  
Force Nonparticipants; \*Program Development;  
\*Retirement  
IDENTIFIERS Chicago; Illinois

### ABSTRACT

The present study was conceived as a means of gathering basic data on current pre- and post-retirement activities in Metropolitan Chicago. Further, the research was designed to reflect the attitude of the area's business and industrial community toward such programming. Planned in mid-1969, the study was begun officially with the distribution in October of an initial survey questionnaire (Appendix B); distribution of the second research instrument (Appendix C) began in November. Receipt of returns from the two research phases was completed in early 1970. Detailed presentation of survey data is included as Appendix A. The high response to each survey mailing (more than 40% and 87%, respectively) is an indication of the project's success. A typical program is less than 10 years old; is conducted by the personnel department; has little direct involvement from labor representatives; and is participated in on a voluntary basis by a majority of employees. Few firms have full-time or even part-time retirement counselors. The second section of the study, using a volunteer sample, involved an effort to document reasons why retirement programs were not offered by firms. (Author/DB)

# Department of Human Resources



Division for  
Senior Citizens

640 North LaSalle St.  
Chicago, Illinois 606  
Telephone 744-4016

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.



City of Chicago  
Richard J. Daley, Mayor  
Deton J. Brooks, Jr., Commissioner

ED054409

## A SURVEY OF PRE AND POST RETIREMENT PROGRAMS OFFERED BY MAJOR EMPLOYERS OF METROPOLITAN CHICAGO

Prepared by Thomas W. Wilson  
Retirement Planning Supervisor

Division for Senior Citizens  
Robert J. Ahrens, Director

March 1971

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Summary.....	7
The Survey.....	12
SECTION I: PRE AND POST RETIREMENT PROGRAMS.....	13
Participants.....	13
Procedure.....	14
Results.....	14
Background Information.....	16
Compulsory and Non-Compulsory Retirement.....	18
<u>Pre-Retirement Programs</u> .....	22
History of Programs.....	22
Program Responsibility.....	23
Participation.....	25
Scheduling.....	27
Approach.....	27
Technique.....	30
Subject Matter.....	34
Materials Used.....	37
<u>Post-Retirement Programs</u> .....	37
SECTION II: REASONS WHY PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS HAD NOT BEEN OFFERED PREVIOUSLY.....	40
Participants.....	41
Procedure.....	41
Results.....	41

	Page
Reasons for No Program.....	42
Major Reasons.....	43
<b>Appendixes</b>	
Appendix A.....	45
Tables I through 57. Data from Section I and II returns in detailed form.	
Appendix B.....	93
Section on I Questionnaire	
Appendix C.....	96
Section II Questionnaire	
Appendix D.....	97
Statement of criteria for good pre-retirement program.	
Appendix E.....	99
Excerpt from Division for Senior Citizens' response to U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging.	

## INTRODUCTION

Twenty million Americans, 13,000 of whom are over 100, are now age 65 or older with a net increase of 820 individuals per day.<sup>1</sup> Annually, more than 300,000 persons enter this group and what has become the age of retirement. The average person can expect to live 14 to 16 1/2 years after retirement at age 65.

People are living longer today than in generations past. While the practice of compulsory retirement itself raises serious questions, retirement at age 65 is a firmly established common practice with earlier retirement becoming increasingly more common.

Are retiring persons -- either on their own initiative or as a result of stimulation from their employers -- making preparations for their later years? Are employees -- sufficiently in advance of their actual retirement date -- giving serious consideration to such matters as financial planning, physical and mental health, use of leisure time, family relationships, legal problems and living arrangements? Most people would agree that these are important considerations during the middle forty or fifty years of a person's life. Are they less important during the retirement years? In fact, it can be argued that income, health, time, housing and interpersonal relationships are of greater importance after a person retires.

1. Herman B. Brotman, "Useful Facts #15," National Population Trends as of July 1, 1966, Administration on Aging, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, January 1967.

Retirement can be a positive and meaningful experience -- productive, fulfilling, a Golden Age in every sense. One retired person has remarked, "The rest of your life can be the best of your life."

However, too often retirement is a time of poverty, uselessness and loneliness. Many retirees withdraw from life handicapped by fear, worry and ignorance. In an August 1969 statement to the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual, U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, then conducting hearings on the question of "The Federal Role in Encouraging Pre-Retirement Training and New Work-Lifetime Patterns," Robert J. Ahrens, Director of the Division for Senior Citizens of the Chicago Department of Human Resources, remarked:

For most people retirement is not a Golden Age and for all too many it is life at the meanest survival stage with government trying when it does to find ways of funding partial answers to desperate problems of older people who have been made unproductive. The whole thing does not make sense.

To live, said Justice Holmes, is to function. These people have been left without function in terms of our society's present priorities and its concepts of education, work, and leisure. We think the priorities need to be re-ordered and the concepts re-thought.

We do not believe that another generation of older Americans will accept life in a free society on these terms.

The person about to retire too often sees the retirement years as a frightening experience, potentially confusing and self-destructive. In his address at the "Time for Living" Conference on Planning and Preparation for Retirement (Chicago,

1959), Thomas Collins, then author of "The Golden Years" column of the Chicago Daily News, stated:

People in our time simply do not know how to retire.

This, it seems to me, might be the most important of all things for you to ponder. People do not know how to retire. And their ignorance is all wrapped up in pride and ego. They will look you squarely in the eyes and lie to you about it until sundown. They will tell you they don't need any help ... that they have things all worked out ... that they're going to have a wonderful time ... that they've got it made.

Then they will walk proudly away, until they round the first corner. And at that point they will slouch, and shuffle home to nothing.

For people such as you who would help those facing retirement I suggest that you start from the premise that virtually nobody knows how to retire - and that virtually nobody will admit it.

What, from that premise on, can you do?

The need for proper and adequate preparation for retirement should be obvious. If what has been previously stated or implied is not sufficiently compelling, additional reasons can be noted:

1. It is logical to prepare for retirement. Consider the havoc that would result - personally and corporately - if key aspects of life were left only to impulse response;
2. It is consistent to plan for the retirement years. Aging is all of life. We understand why other segments of the aging spectrum - i.e. the childhood, education and employment years - should be carefully planned. The same careful planning should be given also to the retirement years - rapidly becoming one-third of the life span;
3. Retirement is a matter of vocation as is education, parenthood, marriage, and employment. It may be old fashioned but none-the-less true that what is worth doing is worth doing well; and,

4. Retirement is a matter of responsible commitment to the community, as well as to those with whom one is interpersonally related and to one's self as an individual.

Preparation for retirement is a community responsibility rather than a singular institutional responsibility. As such, retirement planning should involve the best interests and efforts of business and industry, government, religious organizations, schools, families, and the individual himself.

Since much of a person's life is related to employment and since the major part, if not all, of a person's retirement income is inseparably related to his employment, the employer has a particular responsibility in pre-retirement and ideally in post-retirement programming.

Pre-retirement and post-retirement programs are not without benefit to the employer. Testimony from top executives given during a 1964 survey<sup>2</sup> of larger Chicago employers indicated that such programs:

1. Increase production of older employees because of increased loyalty to the company, desire of the employee to reach retirement goals and relief of "tensions";
2. Improve morale of both those directly involved and other employees;
3. Improve public relations and company image, both among employees and in their spheres of influence; and,
4. Add esprit de corps with the current staff, particularly during the five-year period before retirement.

2. Arthur R. Weed, "Preparing Workers for Retirement" (a Chicago area survey), Mayor's Commission for Senior Citizens, Chicago, October 1964.



One executive reported: "A retired employee who is enjoying his retirement years is a living advertisement for his employers. A contented retired worker is likely to remember with pleasure his years at work and to speak well of the company to his younger friends and neighbors." Another added, "Our studies showed to our satisfaction that retirement planning pays -- both for the company and for the employee."

In approved practices in retirement preparation, it is the employer's role (1) to guide the employee in planning his own retirement, (2) to stimulate positive thinking about preparation for retirement and retirement per se, (3) to serve as a resource in disseminating factual information pertinent to successful retirement, (4) to motivate the employee to plan early for retirement and (5) to aid employees in achieving an over-all successful retirement life.

Basic problems in retirement education and planning involve attitudinal, social and economic stigmas attached to the expression "retirement," barriers between labor and management, unwillingness on the part of the employer and the employee to recognize the importance of personal, long-range planning and the over-all newness of such a field with critical implications for change and improvement.

In one of a series of pre-retirement program bulletins published by the Division for Senior Citizens, Arthur R. Weed, Consultant on Retirement, has stated "It is true that not everyone will need help in planning for retirement. No one

can tell an employee exactly how to retire, but nearly everyone can profit from suggestions."<sup>3</sup>

All those knowledgeable in the field of retirement preparation agree on its importance. Yet, too often, in our experience, the responsibility for guiding and assisting employees in planning for their retirement is essentially forgotten except for management's token efforts. Retirement planning is an educational process. While the employee has responsibility for participating in that process, the employer has responsibility for establishment and supervision in order that the process may become a reality.

In a company publication, William L. Johnson, former Industrial Relations Vice President of the Bell & Howell Company, indicated that while the benefits Bell & Howell derive from their pre-retirement program are not tangible, he is convinced that they are real, and further stated:

We feel that our employees deserve as much guidance as we can give them at retirement. After all, they've spent most of their lives training and working toward the jobs they now have to leave. Usually, they've been with us several years; you can't pay for loyalty like that with just a check and a pat on the back.<sup>4</sup>

3. "Pre-Retirement Programs," Report Number 10, Mayor's Commission for Senior Citizens, City of Chicago, 1967.
4. "Pension Plans Don't Cover Everything," Bell & Howell Company, Chicago, Illinois, February 1956.

## SUMMARY

The Division for Senior Citizens of the City of Chicago's Department of Human Resources, with thirteen years of experience in the field of retirement planning, has conducted three retirement planning surveys - in 1959, 1964 and one begun in 1969.

The 1959 survey of 17,500 organizations preceded a Chicago conference on preparation for retirement. In 1964, the Division surveyed pre-retirement program activities among 75 Chicago firms.

In order to evaluate past performance, critique current activities and plan properly for future programming, the Division began in 1969 a study of types and levels of pre and post-retirement programming conducted by major employers in Metropolitan Chicago.

The present study was conceived as a means of gathering basic data on current pre and post-retirement activities in Metropolitan Chicago. Further, the research was designed to reflect the attitude of the area's business and industrial community toward such programming. Such data are essential to the Division in its continuing effort to provide consultation and technical assistance to Chicago employers.

Planned in mid-1969, the study was begun officially with the distribution in October of an initial survey questionnaire (Appendix B). Distribution of the second research instrument (Appendix C) began in November. Receipt of returns from the two research phases was completed in early 1970. Following

tabulation and analysis of data from the returns, a first draft of the research report was submitted in September 1970.

Detailed presentation of survey data is included as Appendix A. Where necessary, select data in summary form is interspersed throughout the text of the report.

The high response to each survey mailing - more than forty percent and eighty-seven percent respectively -- is one indication of the project's success. More important, the excellent response reflects the positive attitude and sophistication in Chicago toward preparation for retirement, concern for employees after retirement and, we believe, the cooperative relationship with the Division for Senior Citizens.

Employee population and retirement data measure the number of Chicagoans presently benefitting from pre and post-retirement programming and provide encouragement to employers to offer such programs for their employees.

The high percentage of firms with compulsory retirement policies identified in this survey was expected. However, it was encouraging to note the large number of employers permitting retirement on a voluntary basis.

No effort was made in this survey to determine any increase or decrease in compulsory retirement practices. Data from the returns did support the contention that where retirement is voluntary employees do tend to continue working beyond age sixty-five, the customary age for compulsory retirement.

For those firms presently offering retirement planning programs, a typical program, as evidenced by the returns, is less than ten years old, conducted by the personnel department, has little direct involvement from labor representatives and witnesses participation (on a voluntary basis) from a majority of employees. Few firms have full or even part-time retirement counselors. Less than 30 percent make special efforts to encourage spouse attendance in pre-retirement programs.

Most programs are scheduled on company time. This is seen as an added indication of interest in the employee.

Although retirement planning programs, as offered by the employers, are intended for the 60 + age bracket, most employees are first contacted for pre-retirement planning in the last nine years of their careers.

Individual counseling, in spite of considerable variance in size of employee populations, is the predominant technique. Although all employers average less than three individual interviews with each employee, all employees had the potential benefit of at least five pre-retirement contacts, when all techniques were considered together.

While programs typically stressed financial preparation, considerable emphasis was placed upon use of time, health and legal matters.

Special efforts to maintain contacts with retired employees

varied in proportion to the employer's interest in pre-retire-programming. Mailing newsletters, visitation programs, personal letters and events planned for or to include retirees were leading examples of such efforts. Most employers provided special services for their former employees. Among several possibilities, insurance, counseling and medical resources were most common.

The second section of the study, using a volunteer sample, involved an effort to document reasons why retirement planning programs were not offered. A firm's willingness to assist with this additional research is another measure of interest in assisting employees in planning for their retirement.

Participants indicated their "general" reasons for not offering a pre-retirement program and, where requested, ranked their responses as first, second and third "major" reasons.

The majority of respondents cited "too few employees retiring" as either a reason or the major reason for no program. The rationale behind such responses did not always coincide with other data on employee population and the percentage of employees retiring each year.

Frequently, employer attitude, necessarily not based on research or factual data, appears to be the real reason for the absence of a program. This is supported by the fact that "matter of priorities" was cited as the second major reason and as the third general reason.

However, other reasons cited and comments from respondents, as well as their participation in both Section I and Section II of the present study, indicate definite changes in the attitude of management toward the inclusion of retirement preparation programs in corporate planning.

### THE SURVEY

With attention focused upon Metropolitan Chicago's more than thirteen hundred major<sup>1</sup> employers, this project was designed to enable the Division for Senior Citizens to (1) have a better understanding of the attitudes of employers toward preparation for retirement and actual retirement, (2) structure activities to meet more adequately the needs of employers and employees alike and (3) suggest remedial measures in behalf of those already retired.

Objectives of the study were:

1. To measure, on the basis of objective answers:
  - a. Growth in scope and depth of programs conducted by our clientele<sup>2</sup>,
  - b. Programming differences between clients and non-clients,
  - c. Differences in programming which may be attributed to type of firm, number of employees, etc.,
  - d. Existing programs against the criteria for a good program as stated by the Division<sup>3</sup>.

1. Major employer, as used in this survey and report, is a firm with 250 or more employees, so defined by the Chicago Assn. of Commerce and Industry, in its publication "Metropolitan Chicago Major Employers," 1968.
2. Client is defined as a firm with whom the Division has had some prior degree of program consultation and technical assistance experience.
3. "A Report on the Pre-Retirement Programs of the Division," Division for Senior Citizens, Department of Human Resources, City of Chicago, 1969, pages 24-25 (prepared at the request of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging).



2. To investigate reasons why retirement planning programs have not been offered previously; and,
3. To prepare a report on types and levels of post-retirement contacts between employers and their retired employees.

The survey was divided into two sections: (1) a study of types and levels of pre and post-retirement programs and (2) a study of reasons why retirement planning programs were not offered.

#### SECTION I - PRE AND POST RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

##### Participants

Thirteen hundred and one organizations<sup>4</sup> were asked to participate in Section I of the survey. Two hundred and fifty-two of these were present clients with the remainder representing organizations with whom we had had no previous experience.

The total number of participants (Table 1) included 744 manufacturing and 557 non-manufacturing concerns. Of the clients participating, 194 are manufacturers and 58 non-manufacturers;

---

4. The total number of organizations listed in "Metropolitan Chicago Major Employers," Chicago Assn. of Commerce and Industry, 1968.

among non-clients 550 are manufacturers and 499 non-manufacturers.

Following the pattern of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry's publication, the manufacturing concerns were classified further according to three types - firms with 1000 employees and over, firms with 500 to 1000 employees, and firms with 250 to 500 employees. Non-manufacturers involve only one category - firms with 250 employees and over. These classifications are used throughout the report. Participants within each of these subgroups are noted in Table 1.

### Procedure

A questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent to each participating organization with a request for (1) general background information, (2) a brief description of its pre-retirement planning program or indication of the lack of such a program and (3) a report on the level of post-retirement contacts with the organization's retired employees.

### Results

Results of the Section I survey are summarized in Table 3. Of the total sample, 523 firms (40.2%) responded to this inquiry for information (Table 2). Analysis of the sample shows the following:

Number of participants	1301
Number of responses	523
Percentage of responses	40.2
Number of employees in respondent group	1,212,011
Average number employees retiring each year	15,737
Firms with pre and post-retirement programs	113
Firms with pre-retirement programs	131
Firms interested in establishing programs	154
Firms with post-retirement programs	321

Compared to the results of a similar survey<sup>5</sup> made more than ten years ago by the Division, then the Mayor's Commission for Senior Citizens, the response to the present effort was outstanding. In 1959, preparatory to a conference on planning and preparation for retirement, questionnaires were mailed to more than 17,500 organizations in the Chicago area. Six hundred and twenty organizations (3.5%) responded, including businesses, churches, unions and social agencies. This significant increase in the response percentage over that of 1959 is interpreted as one measure of increased interest in retirement planning programming.

The 523 total respondents in the present survey represent a combined employee population of 1,212,011 and a combined average total of 15,737 employees retiring each year.

One hundred and thirteen firms reported offering both pre and post-retirement programs; 131 firms offered pre-retirement planning programs; 154 firms indicated some degree of interest

5. "Memorandum to Participants - 'Time for Living' - A Conference on Planning and Preparation for Retirement," Mayor's Commission for Senior Citizens, Chicago, September 1959.

in establishing pre-retirement planning programs; and a total of 321 firms were involved in some type of post-retirement programming (Table 3).

### Information

Each participant was asked to indicate the total employee population and the average number of employees retiring each year. The combined totals for all respondents are noted on Table 3.

When respondents did not indicate their total employee population, the minimum number for that particular category - i.e. 1000, 500 or 250 employees - was used in order to arrive at a total employee population force.

When respondents did not indicate an average number of employees retiring each year, the statistical procedure was more complicated. The total employee population (as reported) was divided into the total average number of employees retiring each year (as reported) in order to arrive at a percentage of employees retiring annually. This figure was then applied to the employee population of firms not reporting retirement information in order to derive a comprehensive estimate of the population entering retirement annually.

A comparison of employee populations, the average number of employees retiring each year, and calculated "retirement" percentage is shown in Table 4.

Tables 4 and 5 show employee populations, average number of employees retiring annually and the percentage of employees retiring. Comparisons were made between manufacturing and non-manufacturing sub-groups and between firms presently offering a retirement planning program, firms interested in establishing a program, and firms not interested in establishing programs. The data are summarized as follows:

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Firms presently offering programs</u>			
Response	70	61	131
No. of employees	325,267	182,050	507,317
No. retiring annually	3,472	2,439	5,911
% retiring annually	1.067	1.34	1.165
<u>Firms interested in establishing programs</u>			
Response	87	67	154
No. of employees	202,692	190,840	393,532
No. retiring annually	2,795	2,750	5,545
% retiring annually	1.379	1.441	1.409
<u>Firms not interested in establishing programs</u>			
Response	154	84	239
No. of employees	206,939	104,223	311,162
No. retiring annually	2,307	1,974	4,281
% retiring annually	1.115	1.894	1.376

Analysis of the data shows that the percentage of employees retiring annually is higher for non-manufacturers than for manufacturers. The difference is greatest among firms indicating no interest in establishing pre-retirement planning programs.

Among all the respondents, firms presently offering pre-retirement programs constitute the largest employee population group (507,317) and have the highest number, though not percentage, of employees retiring each year (5,911).

The projected retirement "percentage" is significant as a positive argument for encouraging retirement planning programs. Among reasons cited (these are reported and expanded in Section II) for not offering programs are that the firms have too few employees retiring or are too small. Our experience, of which this research is supportive, has been that such reasons generally involve management attitude or priorities rather than hard data.

The number of employees retiring annually may be either small or large. However, size need not be a deterring factor to a program. Instead, size might be a determining factor as to what type of program should be offered.

#### Compulsory and non-compulsory retirement

All participants were asked to respond to three questions concerning their retirement policy:

"Is retirement compulsory at your firm?"

"If yes, compulsory at what age?"

"If no, what is the average age at which an employee retires?"

The responses to these three questions are summarized in Tables 6 through 18. Comparisons were made for each of the three sub-groups - those offering programs (Tables 7-9), those interested in establishing programs (Tables 10-12), and those not interested in establishing programs (Tables 13-15). Tables 16-18 report a composite comparison for all respondents.

Of the firms providing data (summarized below) on their universal (applicable to all employees) retirement policies, compulsory retirement occurs much more frequently among organizations presently conducting retirement preparation programs, with the frequency decreasing as the reported interest in such programs decreases (Table 6).

	<u>COMPULSORY</u>	<u>NON-COMPULSORY</u>
Firms with pre-retirement programs	92	28
Firms interested in establishing programs	83	62
Firms not interested in establishing programs	85	83
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	260	173

The significance in the relationship between interest in pre-retirement planning programs and compulsory retirement is not fully known. It may indicate a desire on the part of the employer to make forced retirement more palatable through the introduction of a retirement planning program.

Among manufacturers, 75.8% of firms with programs, 57.5% of firms having interest in establishing programs and 54.1% of firms indicating no interest in establishing programs reported having compulsory retirement.

Most non-manufacturers with compulsory retirement followed generally the same percentage pattern as shown for manufacturers, i.e. 77.6% for firms with programs and 56.9% for firms with interest in programs. The one exception occurred among non-manufacturers with no interest in establishing programs where only 44.1% indicated compulsory retirement.

Sixty percent of all respondents furnishing retirement data reported compulsory retirement, 60.6% for manufacturers and 59.3% for non-manufacturers. The difference between the two seems negligible.

Sixty-five was cited most frequently (198 times) as the age of compulsory retirement for most employees. On the other hand, it was surprising to note that 32 firms (14.4%) reported compulsory retirement at an age higher than 65.

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Retirement compulsory at age:</u>			
70	9	8	17
69		1	1
68	7	2	9
67	3		3
66	1	1	2
65	115	83	198

Age 70 (17 times) and age 68 (9 times) were cited most frequently as exceptions to the compulsory retirement at age 65 "rule".



These exceptions occurred somewhat more often among manufacturers than non-manufacturers (20 and 12 times respectively).

No attempt was made to determine if firms were changing the time of compulsory retirement closer to age 65 or altering retirement policies away from compulsory retirement altogether.

Where compulsory retirement applied to certain employees and not to others, in every instance reported it applied to salaried employees, i.e. management.

Among respondents reporting non-compulsory retirement policies applicable to all employees and indicating an average age for such voluntary retirement, a wide variation (from age 59 to age 80) was indicated.

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Average age at voluntary retirement:</u>			
76 and over	1		1
71 - 75		3	3
66 - 70	29	24	53
65	36	32	68
60 - 64	9	4	13
59 and under		1	1

Age sixty-five (48.9%) was cited most frequently. As with the exceptions noted in connection with compulsory retirement, 68 and 70 were the next most frequent ages indicated for non-compulsory retirement.

On the basis of the data obtained from all respondents, it can be stated clearly that where retirement is voluntary (40% of the firms reporting information) employees definitely tend to retire at an age older than sixty-five.

### PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

In the second part of the Section I survey questionnaire, those firms presently offering preparation for retirement programs were asked a series of questions designed to gather basic data and treat in greater detail program technique, subject matter, materials used, experience gained, particular problems, etc.

### History of Programs

Question - "How long have you had this program?"

Age of programs (length of time in operation) varied from those in existence for more than thirty years (4 programs) to those begun in the last one to three years (28 programs) (Table 19).

<u>Age of Programs:</u>	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
26 - 30+ years	3	3	6
21 - 25 "	5	4	9
16 - 20 "	3	4	7
11 - 15 "	10	12	22
6 - 10 "	20	17	37
1 - 5 "	25	17	42

In terms of program age, the greatest concentration (42 programs) occurs in the 1 to 5 year old range, followed closely by 37 programs 6 to 10 years old (Table 20).

It is significant to note that of the firms providing such information, 77.1% report programs as having begun in the last fifteen years. It may be fair to attribute some measure of this growth to the influence of the Division's work since its inception in 1956. The Division established the area of retirement planning as an early priority among its activities.

#### Program Responsibility

Question - "Who conducts the program?"

Responsibility for conducting the pre-retirement programs varied. Both single and multiple-staff responsibility was indicated. Several firms reported designating responsibility to more than one department (Table 21).

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Responsibility for Conducting Programs*</u>			
Personnel Dept.	44	39	83
Industrial Relations Dept.	16	3	19
Employee Benefits Dept.	20	15	35
Other	11	10	21

\*In a number of instances, combined responsibility was indicated.

Personnel departments were cited most frequently. Other departments, namely, Industrial Relations and Employee Benefits, were also involved in conducting programs, depending chiefly upon the size of firm offering these programs.

In a number of instances, particularly among smaller employers, a single personnel officer was assigned responsibility. A few firms reported establishing a retirement planning committee.

Question - "Where applicable, to what extent are labor representatives involved in the program?"

Very few firms indicated that labor representatives had any direct or appreciable involvement in their programs. Two firms (both non-manufacturers) involved labor in the planning stage; five indicated that labor was involved in conducting programs; seven firms reported that labor was directly involved in encouraging employee participation in the programs (Table 22).

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Participation of Labor Representatives			
Planning	-	2	2
Conducting	3	2	5
Encouraging employee participation	6	1	7
Not directly involved	48	38	86
No involvement	3	1	4

More than eighty percent (82.7) of the respondents indicated that labor was not directly involved in their programs. Two firms (both manufacturers with more than 1000 employees) reported emphatically that labor representatives had no involvement.

Question - "Do you employ a retirement planning director or counselor?"

Only 16 firms stated that they were staffed by a director or counselor for retirement planning. Nine of these had full-time

personnel; seven, part-time (Table 23).

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Firms employing a full or part-time retirement counselor			
Full-time	2	7	9
Part-time	1	6	7

In the light of the Division's knowledge, the responses appear to reflect no significant increase in full-time retirement planning personnel (with singular staff function) among firms presently offering such programs. Most of the counselors known to Division staff are employees who have been with a firm for some time. Many of them were instrumental in originating the programs and are involved with them on a shared-time basis. Division program criteria, however, recommend that firms designate one person to have specific and, if possible, full-time responsibility for the organization's program<sup>6</sup>.

#### Program Participation

Question - "Is participation in the program compulsory?

If voluntary, estimate percentage participating."

At least 35 out of 114 possible respondents (30.7%) have stated that participation in their preparation for retirement programs was compulsory for all employees (Table 24).

6. "Response to the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual," U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, on the Question of "The Federal Role in Encouraging Pre-Retirement Training and New Work - Lifetime Patterns," Division for Senior Citizens, Department of Human Resources, City of Chicago, August, 1969. (Appendix E)

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Program participation</u>			
Compulsory	22	13	35
Voluntary	38	41	79

Compulsory participation occurs more often among manufacturers (36.7%) than among non-manufacturers (24.1%). Compulsory participation is seen as an unusual approach in view of known experience that quality programs, offered on a voluntary basis, usually generate high employee participation, very frequently at the 90% level.

Fewer than nine percent (8.8) of the firms are experiencing employee participation, when voluntary, at below the 50% level. Eight of these ten firms are non-manufacturers.

Question - Is employee's spouse encouraged to participate?

If yes, estimate percent participating."

Only 26.5% of those responding to this question indicated that the employee's spouse was encouraged to participate in their programs - 33.9% of the responding manufacturers and 22.7% of the responding non-manufacturers (Table 25).

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Participation of spouse encouraged</u>			
Yes	20	10	30
No	39	44	83

Data on spouse participation was insufficient to permit meaningful conclusions.

### Program Scheduling

Question - "How is your program scheduled - company time, employee time or company and employee time?"

This is an important question because the time schedule selected is often a critical factor affecting the degree of participation.

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
program scheduling			
Company time	46	43	89
Employee time	6	4	10
Company & employee time	9	9	18

The majority of all programs presently being conducted are held on company time - 76.1% for all respondents, 75.4% for manufacturers and 76.8% for non-manufacturers.

Less than nine percent (8.5) are held on employee time and less than sixteen percent (15.4) are held on combined company and employee time. With each of these two techniques, frequency distribution was approximately equal between manufacturers and non-manufacturers.

Manufacturers with 1000 employees and over are the largest sub-group reporting programs (20%) conducted on company and employee time.

### Program Approach and Technique

In its Statement of Criteria, prepared for the U. S. Senate

Special Committee on Aging,<sup>7</sup> the Division proposed that "employees should be encouraged to begin planning for retirement a minimum of five years, preferably more, prior to the actual retirement date." The entire Statement is included as Appendix C.

Question - "At what age do you initiate retirement planning contacts with each employee?"

One hundred and eight participants (Table 27) responded to this question, reporting initial contact ages which varied, when a specific age was given, from age 45 to 65.

<u>Age employee first contacted</u>	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non- Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
61 - 65	20	20	40
56 - 60	18	21	39
51 - 55	8	6	14
46 - 50	1	2	3
45 & under	1	-	1

One firm stated that initial contacts were made at the beginning of employment. Seven others reported it to be just prior to the employee's retirement date. Three firms did not initiate contacts, responding only at the request of the individual employee.

Although 28.7% of the firms initiate contacts at age 60 (the age most frequently cited), the data do not reflect a trend toward any one specific age. Thirteen percent began contacts

7. "A Report on the Pre-Retirement Programs of the Division", op. cit., pages 24-25



at age 55; 9.3% at 62 and 17.6% at 64.

Employees at 58.8% of the firms are first contacted for retirement planning at age 60 or younger (3.16% at age 55 or younger). This is evidence that more than one-half of the firms are operating well within the Division's minimum criteria standards.

In this study, the range in ages at which employees are initially contacted compares more than favorably with a similar study,<sup>8</sup> conducted in 1964 for the Division by Arthur R. Weed, the Division's Consultant on Retirement. An analysis of the two studies in light of the number of programs originating in the last five years indicates a definite trend toward lowering the age at which first contacts are made.

Question - "What age group is your program primarily designed to reach?"

Sixty to sixty-four was cited most frequently (91 times) as the age group most programs were presently designed to reach (Table 29). A number of firms indicated more than one age bracket.

8. "Preparing Workers for Retirement", Arthur R. Weed, Mayor's Commission for Senior Citizens, Chicago, October, 1964.

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Age group program designed to reach*			
49 and under	2	-	2
50 - 54	2	1	3
55 - 59	11	10	21
60 - 64	44	47	91
65 & over	9	5	14

\*Some firms indicated more than one age group.

One respondent remarked, "We want to encourage retirement planning at the earliest age possible. However, we are giving priority now to meeting the needs of a large group of employees within a year or so of retirement. Our is a typical, late beginning, crash program."

This is a situation often found in programs during the first five years of their operation, and sometimes longer.

#### Program Technique

Question - "What method(s) are used in conducting your program?"

Participants were asked to provide data of individual counseling, group meetings, home study and mailings program techniques. Responses are shown on Tables 29 and 31 - 33. Multiple replies were reported on numerous returns.

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Methods used in conducting programs			
Individual counseling	49	47	96
Group meetings	25	21	46
Home study	3	9	12
Mailings	20	26	46

Forty-eight percent of the firms use some form of individual counseling; 23% use group meetings; 23% use group mailings; 6% use home study.

Individual counseling and group meetings are methods used more often among manufacturers than non-manufacturers. Non-manufacturers use home study and mailings more often. However, differences are not great, with two meaningful exceptions.

Where mailings are listed 46 times among all participants, 28.3% of these occur among manufacturers with 250-500 employees. Non-manufacturers (also including firms with 250-500 employees) account for 61.9% of the times mailings are cited as a method being used. Mailings appear as one logical or practical method for smaller organizations.

The following two questions were asked to gather additional information concerning a particular firm's use of individual counseling as one program technique (Table 31).

Question - "How many interviews prior to retirement?"  
Data received in response to this question - approximately two-thirds of the firms responding - were limited. However, some definite patterns did appear.

<u>Number of individual counseling interviews</u>	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non- Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
9 - 10	-	1	1
7 - 8	-	-	-
5 - 6	4	4	8
3 - 4	19	15	34
1 - 2	15	21	36

Manufacturers averaged 2.86 interviews per employee; non-manufacturers averaged only slightly less - 2.83 interviews per employee.

Manufacturing sub-groups followed closely the over-all manufacturing average - 2.79, 3.0 and 3.0 respectively. It would be difficult to conclude positively, on the basis of the limited data, that smaller manufacturers (those with fewer than 1000 employees) conduct more interviews with an employee than do larger firms. The differences are not significant.

Question - "Are the interviews regularly scheduled?"

Frequency of scheduling interviews regularly was almost evenly divided among the respondents - 47.2% of the manufacturers and 47.4% of the non-manufacturers.

The exception was noted among manufacturers with 500-1000 employees where four of five schedule them regularly.

The following two questions were asked to secure additional information regarding the use of group meetings among participating employers.

Question - "What is the average size of each group?"  
Only twenty firms gave descriptive data (Table 32). Thirteen of these reported a group size average of less than twenty, with the majority (9 of the 13) averaging 10-20.

Question - "What is the average number of times each group meets?"

Twenty nine firms responded (Table 33). For all firms, groups were meeting an average of 6.1 times. More than forty eight percent (48.3%) indicated that their groups met 8 or more times each.

Question - "Which of the four methods, if you use more than one, is your primary approach?"

Over seventy-five percent (75.5%) of the 92 firms responding indicated individual counseling as their primary method in retirement planning contacts - 80% of the manufacturers and 69% of the non-manufacturers (Table 30).

<u>Primary method used</u>	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Individual counseling	48	29	77
Group meeting	5	7	12
Home study	1	1	2
Mailings	6	5	11

Group meetings were the primary method 11.8% of the time; mailings 10.9% of the time; and home study 1.9% of the time.

The large use of individual counseling as the primary method should serve to negate the supposition that a large employee population prohibits extensive use of individual contact with an employee preparing for his retirement.

Question - "Considering all possible methods used, what is the average number of pre-retirement planning contacts with each employee?"

Among all respondents, each employee is contacted an average of 5.1 times in programs presently being conducted (Table 34).

	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non-Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
<u>Number of pre-retirement contacts</u>			
21 and over	1	-	1
16 - 20	1	1	2
11 - 15	3	4	7
6 - 10	5	12	17
1 - 5	36	36	72

The average of manufacturers (5.2) is only slightly higher than that for non-manufacturers (5.0).

#### Subject Matter

Key topics for coverage in a good preparation for retirement program are (1) financial planning, (2) leisure and work, (3) living arrangements, (4) physical health, (5) mental health and (6) interpersonal relationships.<sup>9</sup>

9. Statement of Criteria, op. cit., page 25

Question - "What topics are specifically scheduled for coverage in your program?"

Results of this study indicate that the topics mentioned above - detailed to include total use of time, legal matters, travel, volunteer services and adult education - are being included in a majority of the programs. Frequency of topic inclusion is noted in Table 35.

Finances are cited most frequently, with the exception of manufacturers with 500-1000 employees. Emphasis upon finances, in proportion to the other topics, appears less among all manufacturers than among non-manufacturers.

Numerous respondents indicated that finances did not remain a dominant theme in their programs. In fact, according to many of the returns, once the definite retirement income - monthly or annual - had been ascertained, program emphasis and participant interest shifted to and remained with such topics as use of time and health.

A study conducted recently in Los Angeles<sup>10</sup> concluded that health was the major problem faced by persons since their retirement.

Although there is the expected emphasis upon finances (cited 96 times), it is interesting to note on Table 35 the

10. "Los Angeles Labor Retiree Research Report," Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, 1967.

rather high frequency of several other topics, namely, use of time (52 times), physical health (52 times), and legal matters (39 times).

The frequency with which topics such as hobbies (29 times), travel (27 times) and volunteer services (19 times) occur, tends to support the Division's recommendation that use of time be given high priority treatment in a retirement planning program.

Among all manufacturers, finances, use of time, physical health and legal matters were the leading topics in that order; among non-manufacturers the order varied slightly, i.e., from finances to physical health, use of time and legal matters (Table 36). The emphasis on financial preparation tends to remain, with only the degree of emphasis differing.

Question - "What is the primary topic covered?"  
As indicated in connection with the previous question, the results here were not really surprising. Finances were cited most often (64.5%) as the primary topic covered - manufacturers (62.3%) and non-manufacturers (66.7%) (Table 37).

Again, manufacturers with 500-1000 employees were an exception. Five of the eight respondents considered use of time their primary topic.



### Materials Used

Question - "Do you use textual materials related to your subject matter?"

More than sixty-five percent (65.7%) of the respondents indicated some use of textual materials in private discussions, group meetings or through distribution for private study (Table 38).

A greater percentage of non-manufacturers (78.8%) than manufacturers (52.0%) used such materials.

Use of a wide variety of materials produced by government agencies, social welfare groups, religious organizations and other special interest concerns was reported.

### POST-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

As stated previously, the third part of Section I involved an effort to gather from all participants a report on post-retirement contacts with the organizations' retired employees. In addition to indicating whether or not a special effort was made, firms were asked to note typical special efforts made and report on special services provided.

Question - "Do you make a special effort to continue a relationship with your retired employees?"

<u>Response to question:</u>	<u>Mfg.</u>	<u>Non Mfg.</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Yes	153	108	261
No	67	55	122
<u>Special Efforts Made:</u>			
Furnishing subscription to periodical for retired persons	32	25	57
Mailing house organ	109	95	204
Planning special events	41	27	68
Writing occasional letters	70	53	123
Encouraging retiree to return for visit	122	81	203
Personal visits to retiree	27	8	35
Other	42	27	69
<u>Special Services Provided:</u>			
Counseling	53	29	82
Medical	59	34	93
Insurance	111	73	184
Educational	2	-	2
Recreational	22	10	32
Other	6	11	17

The majority (89.6%) of firms presently offering pre-retirement programs made special efforts to maintain active liaison with their retirees (Table 40).

Incidence was greater among all manufacturers (95%) than among non-manufacturers (82.1%).

Included among special efforts made by this sub-group were mailing of house organs (79.1%), encouraging retirees to return for visits (73.9%), writing occasional letters (47.8%) and planning special events (30.4%). Approximately thirty percent (27.8) also provided subscriptions to periodicals for retired persons.

Insurance (67%), counseling (46.1%) and medical resources (35.7%) were the leading special services provided.

Sixty-seven percent (67.1%) of firms indicating interest in establishing retirement planning programs also reported special post-retirement efforts - manufacturers (69.9%), non-manufacturers (63.6%) (Table 41).

Encouraging retirees to return for a visit and mailing the house organs were the major special efforts made (approximately 51% in each instance).

Forty-six percent maintained an insurance program and twenty-seven percent offered medical services.

The intensity of post-retirement contact lessens considerably with firms reporting no interest in establishing retirement planning programs (Table 42). Only 51% indicated an interest in this type of employer-retiree relationship.

Programs requiring less employer effort - i.e., encouraging return visits and mailing newsletters - were the chief efforts expended. Provision of some insurance coverage was the only notable special service provided.

Fewer than seventy percent (68.1%) of all respondents made special efforts in post-retirement programming (Table 43). Among all manufacturers, 69.1% did so; among non-manufacturers, 66.3%.

Regardless of the degree of interest in pre-retirement programming, manufacturers consistently made greater efforts toward conducting post-retirement programs than did non-manufacturers.

For all respondents, mailing the house organ was the leading (53.2%) special effort made, followed by encouraging return visits (53%) and writing occasional letters (32.4%).

Insurance (48%), medical services (24.3%) and counseling (21.4%) were the main special services furnished.

Data gathered in this sub-study would substantiate the conclusion that there is a definite correlation between the intensity of interest in pre-retirement programming and the types and levels of post-retirement programs offered by area firms.

#### SECTION II - REASONS WHY PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS HAD NOT BEEN OFFERED PREVIOUSLY

Participants in Section I were asked to indicate their willingness to assist the Division with additional research (see Appendix B, page 3). Favorable responses provided a sample group necessary to investigate various reasons why retirement planning programs had not been offered previously.

### Participants

One hundred and sixty-six firms indicated their willingness to assist with additional research (Table 44). The sample afforded an approximate balance between manufacturing (87) and non-manufacturing (79) concerns.

One-hundred of the Section II sample are among the 154 Section I respondents indicating their interest in establishing pre-retirement programs. This, coupled with their expressed willingness to assist in additional research, is interpreted as an added measure of interest in retirement planning.

### Procedure

The Section II questionnaire (Appendix C) listed thirty reasons, based upon Division experience, for not offering pre-retirement programs. Participants were asked to indicate as many reasons as applied to their particular firm.

When more than one reason was indicated, respondents were asked to rank their first, second and third major reasons.

Data from the returns was tabulated and analysed on the basis of these "general" and "major" reasons.

### Results

Since participation in section II was on the basis of an expressed voluntarism, it was anticipated that results would be high. Returns justified the early anticipation. One hundred

and forty-six (87.9%) of the firms responded, 86.2% of the manufacturers and 89.9% of the non-manufacturers. Data from the returns are shown on Tables 46-57.

#### Reasons for No Program

Respondents used 26 of 30 possible statements, or reasons, to indicate why their particular firm was not offering a pre-retirement program (Table 46).

"Too few employees retiring" was cited 86 times as a reason. Other tables will indicate that this is the leading (in terms of frequency) response.

In order to determine the significance of this particular response, employee population figures were calculated for the sample group, as were projections for the total average number of employees retiring each year (Table 45). Retirement percentages used were those determined earlier in Section I.

For the entire group, an average of more than 35 employees per firm per year are retiring. This would indicate that the reason cited for not offering a program does not, by our criteria, coincide with population data. Thirty-five retiring employees per year would, we believe, be enough to justify a comprehensive retirement planning program.

Our conclusion is that this particular reason chiefly relates employer attitude toward such programs.

-43-

Other reasons cited refer to lack of trained staff, company priorities and younger age of the particular employee force.

The leading reasons among all manufacturers are noted in Table 47. Tables 48-50 compare reasons cited by the three manufacturing sub-groups.

Note that "too few employees retiring" is indicated with increased frequency as the employer size decreases.

Employers with 500-1000 employees have an average of 7 employees retiring annually; those with 250-500 employees, 4 employees.

These figures may not be sufficient to support wide-scale group meeting programs, although having small numbers available is not automatically prohibitive of such program methods. However, the smaller numbers retiring each year are more than adequate for, and even lend themselves to, programs where individual counseling, or at least mailings, seem advantageous.

#### Major Reason

As with the list of general reasons, "too few employees retiring" appears most often (49 times) as the major reason for not offering a program (Table 52). The distribution is about equal between manufacturers and non-manufacturers.

It is interesting to note that "matter of priorities" is ranked second (cited 17 times) as major reasons. It occurs third as a general reason.

Cited third as a major reason is "decision made at corporate office elsewhere" (10 times). Whenever this reason was indicated, it was in every instance shown to be the major reason. Manufacturers listed this as a major reason more often than did non-manufacturers (7 of 10 times).

Our analysis of the major reasons cited is the same as that for response to the general reasons. The attitudes determining whether or not a program will be offered appear not to be grounded on research or fact.

The need for a good retirement planning program is apparent. The benefits of such programs to employees and employers are apparent also. There is little to deter an employer in assisting his employees in preparing adequately for retirement.

Such factors as employee population and geographical distribution of employees can easily be taken into consideration in designing a pre-retirement program to meet a firm's particular situation.



## APPENDIX A

## TABLES 1 THROUGH 57

TABLE 1SECTION I - SAMPLE COMPOSITION

<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>	<u>TOTAL NO. OF PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>CLIENTS</u>	<u>NON-CLIENTS</u>
1000 Employees and over	177	107	70
500 - 1000 Employees	147	41	106
250 - 500 Employees	420	46	374
SUB - TOTAL	744	194	550
 <u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>			
250 Employees and over	557	58	499
TOTAL	1301	252	1049

TABLE 2  
COMPARISON OF SECTION I - SAMPLE VERSUS RETURNS

	<u>TOTAL NO. OF PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>	<u>PERCENT RESPONSE</u>
<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>			
1000 Employees and over	177	114	64.407
500 - 1000 Employees	147	77	52.381
250 - 500 Employees	420	120	28.571
SUB-TOTAL	744	311	41.801
<u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>			
250 Employees and over	557	212	38.061
TOTAL	1301	523	40.1998

TABLE 3  
SECTION I - GENERAL RESULTS

Number of participants	1301
Number of responses	523
Percentage of responses	40.2
Number of employees in respondent group	1,212,011
Average number employees retiring each year	15,737
Firms with pre and post-retirement programs	113
Firms with pre-retirement programs	131
Firms interested in establishing programs	154
Firms with post-retirement programs	321

TABLE 4

EMPLOYEE POPULATION, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES  
RETIRING ANNUALLY, AND ANNUAL RETIREMENT  
RATE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO EMPLOYER'S  
DEGREE OF INTEREST IN PRE-RETIREMENT  
PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+	Mfg. 500-1000	Mfg. 250-500	All Mfg.	Non-Mfg. 250+	All Respondents
I. Response	38	13	19	70	61	131
Number of Employees	311,604	8,680	4,093	325,267	182,050	507,317
Number retiring annually	3,334	78	60	3,472	2,439	5,911
% retiring annually	1.07	.904	1.206	1.067	1.34	1.165
II. Response	39	25	23	87	67	154
Number of Employees	179,619	15,512	7,561	202,692	190,840	393,532
Number retiring annually	2,542	164	89	2,795	2,750	5,545
% retiring annually	1.415	1.058	1.175	1.379	1.441	1.409
III. Response	37	39	78	154	84	239
Number of Employees	157,944	22,523	26,472	206,939	104,223	311,162
Number retiring annually	1,791	238	278	2,307	1,974	4,281
% retiring annually	1.134	1.058	1.052	1.115	1.894	1.376

I - Firms presently offering pre-retirement programs

II - Firms interested in establishing pre-retirement programs

III - Firms not interested in establishing pre-retirement programs

TABLE 5

EMPLOYEE POPULATION, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES  
RETIRING ANNUALLY, AND ANNUAL RETIREMENT  
RATE CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO EMPLOYER'S  
DEGREE OF INTEREST IN PRE-RETIREMENT PRO-  
GRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+	Mfg. 500-1000	Mfg. 250-500	All Mfg.	Non-Mfg. 250+	All Respondents
I. & II.						
Response	77	38	42	157	128	285
Number of Employees	491,223	24,192	12,544	527,959	372,890	900,849
Number Retiring						
annually	5,876	242	149	6,267	5,189	11,456
% Retiring annually	1.196	1.000	1.188	1.187	1.392	1.272
III.						
Response	37	39	78	154	84	238
Number of Employees	157,944	22,523	26,472	206,939	104,223	311,162
Number Retiring						
annually	1,791	238	278	2,307	1,974	4,281
% Retiring annually	1.134	1.058	1.052	1.115	1.894	1.376
I., II. & III.						
Response	114	77	120	311	212	523
Number of Employees	649,167	46,715	39,016	734,898	477,113	1,212,011
Number Retiring						
annually	7,667	480	427	8,574	7,163	15,737
% Retiring annually	1.181	1.028	1.094	1.167	1.501	1.298

I - Firms presently offering pre-retirement programs

II - Firms interested in establishing pre-retirement programs

III - Firms not interested in establishing pre-retirement programs

**TABLE 6****-50-****DISTRIBUTION OF COMPULSORY VERSUS  
NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS**

	<u>COMPULSORY</u>	<u>NON-COMPULSORY</u>
<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
Firms with pre-retirement programs	47	15
Firms interested in establishing programs	46	34
Firms not interested in establishing programs	59	50
Total all manufacturers	152	99
<u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
Firms with pre-retirement programs	45	13
Firms interested in establishing programs	37	28
Firms not interested in establishing programs	26	33
Total all non-manufacturers	108	74
TOTAL ALL RESPONDENTS	260	173

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSAL (APPLICABLE TO ALL  
EMPLOYEES) COMPULSORY AND NON-COMPUSLORY  
RETIREMENT POLICIES AMONG FIRMS WITH PRE-  
RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>COMPULSORY</u>	<u>NON-COMPULSORY</u>
<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
1000 Employees and Over (38)	27	8
500-1000 Employees (13)	8	2
250-500 Employees (19)	12	5
SUB-TOTAL (70)	47	15
<u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
250 Employees and Over (61)	45	13
TOTAL (131)	92	28

( ) Total Number of Respondents  
Reporting Pre-retirement Programs

TABLE 8  
COMPARISON OF COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AGES  
AMONG FIRMS WITH PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+ (38)	Mfg. 500-1000 (13)	Mfg. 250-500 (19)	All Mfg. (70)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (61)	All Respondents (131)
Compulsory for all at age:						
70	1	1		2	3	5
69						
68	3	1		4	1	5
67			1	1		1
66						
65	21	6	10	37	37	74
Compulsory with age variance between salaried hourly employees	2		1	3	4	7
Compulsory for salaried only*	2		1	3	1	4

( ) - Total number of firms reporting  
a pre-retirement program

\* - Data not included in Table 6 totals



TABLE 9  
COMPARISON OF NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AGES  
AMONG FIRMS WITH PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+ (38)	Mfg. 500-1000 (13)	Mfg. 250-500 (19)	All Mfg. (70)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (61)	All Respondents (131)
Average age at voluntary retire- ment						
70					1	1
69	1		1	2		2
68	1	1	1	3		3
67	1			1	1	2
66			1	1		1
65	3		2	5	8	13
60-62					1	1
59					1	1
Average age not given	2			3	1	4

( ) - Total number of firms reporting  
a pre-retirement program

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSAL (APPLICABLE TO ALL EMPLOYEES) COMPULSORY AND NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT POLICIES AMONG FIRMS INDICATING INTEREST IN ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>COMPULSORY</u>	<u>NON-COMPULSORY</u>
<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
1000 employees and over (39)	26	12
500-1000 employees (25)	9	11
250-500 employees (23)	11	11
SUB-TOTAL (87)	46	34
<u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
250 employees and over (67)	37	28
TOTAL (154)	83	62

( ) Total number of respondents indicating an interest in establishing pre-retirement programs

TABLE 11  
COMPARISON OF COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AGES  
AMONG FIRMS INDICATING INTEREST IN  
ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+ (39)	Mfg. 500-1000 (25)	Mfg. 250-500 (23)	All Mfg. (87)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (67)	All Respondents (154)
Compulsory for all at age:						
70		2		2	4	6
69						
68	1			1	1	2
67			1	1		1
66						
65	22	6	9	37	26	63
Compulsory with age variance between salaried & hourly employees	1			1	1	2
Compulsory with exceptions allowed	2			2	4	6
Compulsory with age not reported		1	1	2	1	3
Compulsory for salaried only*	1	2		3		3

( ) - Total number of firms indicating an  
interest in establishing pre-retire-  
ment program

\* - Data not included in Table 9 totals

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AGES  
AMONG FIRMS INDICATING AN INTEREST IN  
ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+ (38)	Mfg. 500-1000 (25)	Mfg. 250-500 (23)	All Mfg. (87)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (67)	All Respondents (154)
Average age at Voluntary Retirement:						
70	1	1		2	3	5
65-70			2	2	1	3
69		2		2	1	3
68-69		1		1		1
68			1	1	4	5
67	1			1	2	3
65-67					1	1
66	2			2		2
65	6	2	5	13	13	26
62-65		2		2	1	3
64		1		1		1
63		1	1	2	1	3
60			1	1		1
Average age not reported	2	1	1	4	1	5

( ) - Total number of firms reporting  
interest in establishing pre-retirement programs

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSAL (APPLICABLE TO ALL EMPLOYEES) COMPULSORY AND NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT POLICIES AMONG FIRMS INDICATING NO INTEREST IN ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>COMPULSORY</u>	<u>NON-COMPULSORY</u>
<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
1000 employees and over (37)	17	13
500-1000 employees (39)	12	8
250-500 employees (78)	30	29
SUB-TOTAL (154)	59	50
<u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
250 employees and over (84)	26	33
TOTAL (238)	85	83

( ) Total number of firms indicating no interest in establishing pre-retirement programs

TABLE 14  
COMPARISON OF COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AGES  
AMONG FIRMS INDICATING NO INTEREST IN  
ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+ (37)	Mfg. 500-1000 (39)	Mfg. 250-500 (78)	All Mfg. (154)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (84)	All Respondents (238)
Compulsory for all at age:						
70	3	1	1	5	1	6
65-70					1	1
69						
68			2	2		4
67			1	1		2
66	1			1	1	2
65	10	8	23	41	20	61
Compulsory with age variance between salaried & hourly employees	2	2	1	5		5
Compulsory with exceptions permitted		1	2	3	3	6
Compulsory with age not reported	1			1		1
Compulsory for salaried only*	2			2	3	5

\* Data not included in Table 12 totals

( ) Total number of firms indicating  
no interest in establishing pre-  
retirement programs

TABLE 15  
COMPARISON OF NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT AGES  
AMONG FIRMS INDICATING NO INTEREST IN  
ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+ (37)	Mfg. 500-1000 (39)	Mfg. 250-500 (78)	All Mfg. (154)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (84)	All Respondents (238)
Average age at voluntary retire- ment:						
65-80			1	1		1
75					1	1
72					1	1
67-72					1	
70		1	3	4	3	7
65-70			1	1	2	3
69						
68	1	1	1	3	3	6
65-68			1	1		1
67		1	1	2	2	4
66						
65	8	3	7	18	11	29
60-65			1	1	1	2
62			1	1		1
60			1	1		1
Average age not reported	4	2	11	17	8	25

( ) - Total number of firms indicating no  
interest in establishing pre-retirement  
programs

TABLE 16

COMPARISON OF UNIVERSAL (APPLICABLE TO ALL EMPLOYEES) COMPULSORY AND NON-COMPULSORY RETIREMENT POLICIES AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS

	<u>Compulsory</u>	<u>Non-Compulsory</u>
<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
1000 employees and over (114)	70	33
500-1000 employees (77)	29	21
250-500 employees (120)	53	45
SUB-TOTAL (311)	152	99
<u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>		
250 employees and over (212)	108	74
TOTAL (523)	260	173

( ) Total number of respondents



TABLE 17  
COMPARISON OF COMPULSORY RETIRE-  
MENT AGES AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS

	Mfg. 1000+ (114)	Mfg. 500-1000 (77)	Mfg. 250-500 (120)	All Mfg. (311)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (212)	All Respondents (523)
Compulsory for all at age:						
70	4	4	1	9	8	17
65-70					1	1
69						
68	4	1	2	7	2	9
67			3	3		3
66	1			1	1	2
65	53	20	42	115	83	198
Compulsory with age variance between salaried & hourly employees	5	2	2	9	5	14
Compulsory with exceptions permitted	2	1	2	9	5	12
Compulsory with age not reported	1	1	1	3	1	4
Compulsory for salaried only*	5	2	1	8	4	12

( ) - Total number of respondents

\* - Data not included in Table 15 totals

TABLE 18  
COMPARISON OF NON-COMPULSORY RETIRE-  
MENT AGES AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS

	Mfg. 1000+ (114)	Mfg. 500-1000 (77)	Mfg. 250-500 (120)	All Mfg. (311)	Non-Mfg. 250+ (212)	All Respondents (523)
Average age at Voluntary Retirement:						
65-80			1	1		1
75					1	1
72					1	1
67-72					1	1
70	1	2	3	6	7	13
65-70			3	3	4	7
69	1	2	1	4	1	5
68-69		1		1		1
68	2	2	3	7	7	14
65-68			1	1		1
67	2	1	1	4	4	8
65-67					1	1
66	2		1	3		3
65	17	5	14	36	32	68
62-65		2		2	1	3
60-65			1	1	1	2
64		1		1		1
63		1	1	2	1	3
62			1	1		1
60-62					1	1
60			2	2		2
59					1	1
Average age not reported	8	4	12	24	10	34

INDEX TO SYMBOLS USED  
IN TABLES 19 THROUGH 43

- A - Manufacturers, 1000 employees and over
- B - Manufacturers, 500 - 1000 employees
- C - Manufacturers, 250 - 500 employees
- s - Total, all manufacturers
  
- D - Non-manufacturers, 250 employees and over
- t - Total all respondents, manufacturers, and non-manufacturers
- ( ) - Total respondents

TABLE 19  
DISTRIBUTION OF PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS  
ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF YEARS IN OPERATION

		A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	S (70)	D (61)	T (131)
30	years	1	1	-	2	2	4
29	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	"	1	-	-	1	1	2
27	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	"	3	1	1	5	3	8
24	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	"	-	-	-	-	1	1
22	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	"	1	-	-	1	2	3
19	"	1	-	-	1	1	2
18	"	1	-	-	1	1	2
17	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	"	3	-	1	4	9	13
14	"	1	-	-	1	2	3
13	"	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	"	3	-	-	4	1	5
11	"	1	-	1	2	-	2
10	"	10	1	3	14	9	23
9	"	1	-	-	1	1	2
8	"	2	-	1	3	3	6
7	"	-	-	-	-	2	2
6	"	1	-	1	2	2	4
5	"	1	4	3	8	-	8
4	"	2	-	-	2	3	5
3	"	1	2	1	3	4	7
2	"	2	2	3	7	5	12
1	"	1	1	2	4	5	9
Age Not Stated		1	1	2	4	4	8

TABLE 20  
DISTRIBUTION (IN 5-YEAR INCREMENTS) OF  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO  
NUMBER OF YEARS IN OPERATION

		<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
26-30	years	2	1	-	3	3	6
21-25	"	3	1	1	5	4	9
16-20	"	3	-	-	3	4	7
11-15	"	8	-	2	10	12	22
6-10	"	14	1	5	20	17	37
1-5	"	7	9	9	25	17	42
AGE NOT STATED		1	1	2	4	4	8

TABLE 21

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPANY DEPARTMENT  
RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDUCTING PROGRAMS\*

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
Personnel Department	21	9	14	44	39	83
Industrial Relations Dept.	10	4	2	16	3	19
Employee Benefits Department	19	1	-	20	15	35
Other	6	2	3	11	10	21

\* In a number of instances, combined responsibility was indicated.

TABLE 22

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION BY LABOR  
REPRESENTATIVES IN PROGRAMS

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
Planning	-	-	-	-	2	2
Conducting	2	-	1	3	2	5
Encouraging employee participation	3	1	2	6	1	7
Not directly involved	31	6	11	48	38	86
No involvement	2	-	1	3	1	4

TABLE 23

NUMBER OF FIRMS EMPLOYING A FULL OR PART-TIME  
RETIREMENT PLANNING DIRECTOR OR COUNSELOR

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
Full-Time	1	1	-	2	7	9
Part-Time	1	-	-	1	6	7

TABLE 24

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPULSORY, VERSUS VOLUNTARY  
EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAMS AND PER-  
CENT OF PARTICIPATION WHEN VOLUNTARY

	A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	S (70)	D (67)	T (131)
Compulsory	11	3	8	22	13	35
Voluntary	25	6	7	38	41	79
Percent participation when Voluntary						
100	6	-	2	8	9	17
90-100	13	-	3	16	20	36
80-90	2	1	-	3	2	5
70-80	-	-	-	1	2	3
60-70	-	-	-	-	1	1
50-60	1	2	-	3	2	5
40-50	-	-	-	-	1	1
30-40	-	-	-	-	3	3
20-30	1	1	-	2	3	5
10-20	-	-	-	-	1	1

TABLE 25

NUMBER OF FIRMS ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION  
OF EMPLOYEE'S SPOUSE IN PROGRAMS AND PER-  
CENT OF SPOUSE PARTICIPATION

	A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	S (70)	D (61)	T (131)
Encouraged	12	4	4	20	10	30
Not encouraged	21	5	13	39	44	83
Percent of participation						
100	1	1	1	3	1	4
90-100	1	1	2	4	2	6
80-90	-	-	-	-	-	-
70-80	-	-	-	-	1	1
60-70	-	-	-	-	-	-
50-60	1	-	1	2	2	4
40-50	-	-	-	-	1	1
30-40	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-30	1	1	-	2	1	3
10-20	2	-	-	2	2	4
0-10	-	-	-	-	2	2

TABLE 26

DISTRIBUTION OF TIME PERIOD WHEN  
PROGRAMS ARE CONDUCTED

	A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	S (70)	D (61)	TOTAL (131)
Company Time	28	9	9	46	43	89
Employee Time	-	3	3	6	4	10
Company: Employee Time	7	-	2	9	9	18



TABLE 27

**DISTRIBUTION OF AGE AT WHICH EMPLOYEE  
IS FIRST CONTACTED FOR RETIREMENT PLANNING**

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (43)	<u>C</u> (49)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (81)	<u>TOTAL</u> (131)
Age: 65	2			2	1	3
64	6	1	4	11	8	19
63	2	1	1	4	4	8
62	1	2		3	7	10
61						
60	10	2	3	15	15	31
59	1		1	2	2	4
58			1	1	2	3
57					1	1
56						
55	6		2	8	6	14
50					2	2
49	1			1		1
45	1			1		1
Just prior to retirement	3	1	1	5	2	2
At employee's request	1	1		2	1	3
Beginning of Employment					1	1

TABLE 28

EMPLOYEE AGE GROUP  
FOR WHICH PROGRAMS  
ARE PRIMARILY INTENDED\*

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
49 and under	2			2		2
50 - 54	2			2	1	3
55 - 59	8		3	11	10	21
60 - 64	26	8	10	44		91
65 and over	5		4	9	5	14

\* Some firms indicated more than one age group

TABLE 29

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL METHODS USED  
BY EMPLOYERS IN CONDUCTING PRO-  
GRAMS

	A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	s (70)	D (61)	T (131)
Individual Counseling	32	7	10	49	47	96
Group Meetings	18	4	3	25	21	46
Home Study	1		2	3	9	12
Mailings	13	2	5	20	26	46

TABLE 30

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL METHODS USED  
BY EMPLOYERS IN CONDUCTING PRO-  
GRAMS

	A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	s (70)	D (61)	T (131)
Individual Counseling	32	6	10	48	29	77
Group Meetings	5			5	7	12
Home Study			1	1	1	2
Mailings	1	2	3	6	5	11

TABLE 31

AVERAGE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING  
INTERVIEWS WITH EMPLOYEE PRIOR TO EM-  
PLOYEE'S RETIREMENT

	A (38)	B (13)	C (19)	S (70)	D (61)	T (131)
<u>Number of Interviews</u>						
10	-	-	-	-	1	1
9	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	2	-	-	2	1	3
5	-	1	1	2	3	5
4	4	-	1	5	4	9
3	7	3	4	14	11	25
2	7	2	1	10	15	25
1	4	-	1	5	6	11

Interviews Regularly  
Scheduled

Yes	10	4	3	17	18	26
No	14	1	4	19	20	39

TABLE 32

COMPARISON OF AVERAGE SIZE OF DISCUSSION GROUPS

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
50 and over					1	1
40-50	1			1	1	2
30-40	1			1		1
20-30				1	2	3
10-20	3	1		4	5	9
0-10	1		1	2	2	4

TABLE 33

NUMBER OF SESSIONS SCHEDULED FOR EACH  
SERIES OF GROUP DISCUSSION MEETINGS

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
12	1	-	-	1	-	1
11	1	-	-	1	2	3
10	2	-	-	2	1	3
9	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	3	-	-	3	4	7
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	-	2	-	2	2	4
5	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	3	-	-	3	-	3
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	-	-	-	-	2	2
1	1	1	-	2	4	6

TABLE 34

AVERAGE NUMBER OF PRE-RETIREMENT CONTACTS  
WITH EACH EMPLOYEE CONSIDERING ALL PRO-  
GRAM METHODS USED

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
36	1			1		1
20				-	1	1
16	1			1		1
15			1	1		1
14				-		-
13	1			1	1	2
12	1			1	3	4
11				-		-
10	1			1	2	3
9				-	1	1
8	2			2	1	3
7				-	2	2
6	2			2	6	8
5	1	1	3	5	6	11
4	3	2	1	6	4	10
3	8	3	4	15	13	28
2	6		1	7	10	17
1	2		1	3	3	6

**TABLE 35**  
**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF INDIVIDUAL**  
**TOPICS SCHEDULED FOR COVERAGE IN PROGRAMS**

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
Finances	30	6	13	49	47	96
Use of Time	15	8	8	31	21	52
Mental Health	10		2	12	11	23
Physical Health	18	3	5	26	26	52
Legal Matters	13	3	4	20	19	39
Housing	12	1	3	16	11	27
Travel	8	1	4	13	14	27
Hobbies	9	2	5	16	13	29
Volunteer Services	7	3	1	11	8	19
Interpersonal Relations	2	1		3	9	12
Adult Education	4	2	1	7	4	11
Other	6		2	8	11	19

TABLE 36  
COMPARISON FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (RANKED) OF TOPICS SCHEDULED  
FOR COVERAGE IN PROGRAMS OFFERED BY MANUFACTURERS VERSUS NON-MANUFACTURERS

<u>Manufacturers</u>	<u>Non-Manufacturers</u>	<u>All Respondents</u>
Finances (49)	Finances (47)	Finances (96)
Use of Time (31)	Physical Health (26)	Use of Time (52)
Physical Health (26)	Use of Time (21)	Physical Health (52)
Legal Matters (20)	Legal Matters (19)	Legal Matters (39)
Housing (16)	Travel (14)	Hobbies (29)
Hobbies (16)	Hobbies (13)	Housing (27)
Travel (13)	Mental Health (11)	Travel (27)
Mental Health (12)	Housing (11)	Mental Health (23)
Volunteer Services (11)	Interpersonal Relationships (9)	Volunteer Services (19)
Adult Education (7)	Volunteer Services (8)	Interpersonal Relationships (12)
Interpersonal Relationships (3)	Adult Education (4)	Adult Education (11)
Other (8)	Other (11)	Other (19)



TABLE 37

DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY SUBJECT MATTER  
OFFERED BY ALL RESPONDENTS

	<u>A</u> (38)	<u>B</u> (13)	<u>C</u> (19)	<u>S</u> (70)	<u>D</u> (61)	<u>T</u> (131)
Finances	22	3	8	23	36	69
Use of Time	10	5	3	18	16	34
Mental Health	1			1	1	2
Physical Health					1	1
Legal Matters						
Housing						
Travel						
Hobbies	1			1		1
Volunteer Services						
Interpersonal Relationships						
Adult Education						
Other						

TABLE 38

INDICATION OF USE OF TOPIC-RELATED  
SPECIAL TEXTUAL MATERIALS IN  
CONDUCTING PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000 + (38)	Mfg. 500-1000 (13)	Mfg. 250-500 (19)	All Mfg. (70)	Non-Mfg. 250 + (61)	All Respondents (131)
Yes	16	3	7	26	41	67
No	15	4	5	24	11	35

TABLE 39

EXTENT OF USE OF DIVISION FOR SENIOR  
CITIZENS' RETIREMENT PLANNING MA-  
TERIALS, WHERE REPORTED, IN CONDUCT-  
ING PROGRAMS

Division Materials Used:

Yes	11	3	4	18	16	34
No	20	4	8	32	39	71

Type of Material Used:

Film	4	1	-	5	6	11
Booklet	11	3	4	18	15	33

TABLE 40

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF POST-RETIREMENT PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES AMONG FIRMS WITH PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	Mfg. 1000+	Mfg. 500-1000	Mfg. 250-500	All Mfg.	Non-Mfg. 250+	All Response
Special effort made to continue relationship with retired employees:						
Yes	34	9	14	57	46	103
No	1	1	-	2	10	12
Special Efforts Made:						
Furnishing subscription to periodicals for retired persons	11	4	2	17	15	32
Mailing house organ	30	7	13	50	41	91
Planning special events	14	2	5	21	14	35
Writing occasional letters	20	5	8	33	22	55
Encouraging retiree to return for visit	28	7	12	47	38	85
Personal visits to retiree	9	2	3	14	3	17
Other	9	1	4	14	15	29
Special Services Provided:						
Counseling	18	5	8	31	22	53
Medical	10	2	9	21	20	41
Insurance	21	6	13	40	37	77
Educational	1	-	-	1	-	1
Recreational	12	2	1	15	4	19
Other	2	-	1	3	8	11

TABLE 41

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF POST-RETIREMENT PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES AMONG FIRMS INDICATING INTEREST  
IN ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Special effort made to continue relationship with retired employees	A		B		C		S		D		T	
Yes No												
	23	15	13	51	35	86						
	9	5	8	22	20	42						
<u>Special Efforts Made:</u>												
Furnishing subscription to periodical for retired persons	4	4	2	10	6	16						
Mailing house organ	14	10	7	31	34	65						
Planning special events	7	4	2	13	7	20						
Writing occasional letters	8	7	6	21	11	32						
Encouraging retiree to return for visit	15	11	12	38	27	65						
Personal visits to retiree	4	1	1	6	2	8						
Other	7	2	4	13	13	26						
<u>Special Services Provided:</u>												
Counseling	5	4	5	15	4	19						
Medical	15	6	5	26	8	34						
Insurance	20	9	11	40	19	59						
Educational	1	-	-	1	-	1						
Recreational	1	-	-	1	5	6						
Other	-	-	1	1	2	3						

TABLE 42

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF POST-RETIREMENT PROGRAM  
ACTIVITIES AMONG FIRMS INDICATING NO INTEREST  
IN ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Special effort made to continue relationship with retired employees:	Mfg. 1000+	Mfg. 500-1000	Mfg. 250-500	All Mfg.	Non-Mfg. 250+	All Respondents
Yes	13	12	20	45	27	72
No	12	7	24	43	25	68
<u>Special Efforts Made:</u>						
Furnishing subscription to periodical for retired persons	3	-	2	5	4	9
Mailing house organ	10	8	10	28	20	48
Planning special events	2	3	2	7	6	13
Writing occasional letters	4	6	6	16	10	26
Encouraging retiree to return for visit	9	13	15	37	16	53
Personal visits to retiree	-	2	5	7	2	9
Other	5	6	5	16	6	22
<u>Special Services Provided:</u>						
Counseling	2	3	2	7	3	10
Medical	5	3	4	12	6	18
Insurance	10	8	13	31	17	50
Educational	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recreational	2	2	2	6	1	7
Other	1	-	1	2	1	3

TABLE 43

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF POST-RETIREMENT  
PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS

	Mfg. 1000+	Mfg. 500-1000	Mfg. 250-500	All Mfg.	Non-Mfg. 250+	All Respondents
<b>Special effort made to continue relationship with retired employees:</b>						
Yes	70	36	47	153	108	261
No	22	13	32	67	55	122
<b>Special Efforts Made:</b>						
Furnishing subscription to periodical for retired persons	18	8	6	32	25	57
Mailing house organ	54	25	30	109	95	204
Planning special events	23	9	9	41	27	68
Writing occasional letters	32	18	20	70	53	123
Encouraging retiree to return for visit	52	31	39	122	81	203
Personal visits to retiree	13	5	9	27	8	35
Other	21	8	13	42	27	69
<b>Special Services:</b>						
Counseling	26	12	15	53	29	82
Medical	30	11	18	59	34	93
Insurance	51	23	37	111	73	184
Educational	2	-	-	2	-	2
Recreational	15	4	3	22	10	32
Other	3	-	3	6	11	17

TABLE 44  
SECTION II - SAMPLE COMPOSITION

<u>MANUFACTURERS:</u>	<u>Total Participants</u>		<u>No. of Responses</u>
1000 Employees and over	32	(18)	28
500 - 1000 Employees	26	(15)	22
250 - 500 Employees	29	(16)	25
SUB-TOTAL	87	(49)	75
 <u>NON-MANUFACTURERS:</u>			
250 Employees and over	79	(51)	71
TOTAL	166	(100)	146

( ) Participants with interest in establishing pre-retirement programs

TABLE 45

SECTION II SAMPLE ACCORDING TO DEGREE OF INTEREST  
IN RETIREMENT PREPARATION PROGRAMS, SIZE OF EMPLOYEE  
POPULATION, AND NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES RETIRING ANNUALLY

I. 100 Firms interested in establishing programs		Mfg. 1000+	Mfg. 500-1000	Mfg. 250-500	All Mfg.	Non-Mfg. 250+	All Respondents
No. of Employees	100,900	8,960	5,305	115,168	118,583	233,748	
No. Retiring Annually	1,427	95	62	1,584	1,709	3,293	
II. 66 Firms not inter- ested in establishing programs							
No. of Employees	71,718	8,292	5,706	85,716	46,982	132,698	
No. Retiring Annually	813	88	60	916	890	1,851	



TABLE 46

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AMONG ALL RESPONDENTS OF REASONS  
FOR NOT ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Number of</u> <u>Manufacturers</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	86	41
"No trained staff available"	43	23
"Matter of priorities....."	36	17
"Employee force generally young"	32	16
"Firm too small"	29	14
"Important...never got around to it"	23	11
"No real reason"	17	11
"Thought about...uncertain how to..."	15	9
"Too much time involved"	14	7
"Don't believe employees interested"	14	7
"Never gave matter much thought"	13	4
"Decision made elsewhere..."	10	7
"Cost is too high"	9	4
"Didn't know where to go for help"	8	5
"Good salary and pension...enough"	7	4
"Employees feel this is private matter"	7	2
"Unaware of such programs elsewhere"	7	2
"Doubt benefit of such programs"	6	5
"Doubt benefit to employee"	6	4
"Company policy not to interfere"	5	-
"Have just neglected our responsibility"	5	2
"Doubt benefit...to company"	4	2
"Not a company responsibility"	3	2
"Unions should be responsible"	3	1
"Afraid unions would object"	1	-
"Other"	28	13

TABLE 47

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AMONG ALL MANUFACTURERS OF REASONS  
FOR NOT ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>Frequency</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	41
"No trained staff available"	23
"Matter of priorities...."	17
"Employee force generally young"	16
"Firm too small"	14
"Important...never got around to it"	11
"No real reason"	11
"Thought about..uncertain how to.."	9
"Too much time involved"	7
"Don't believe employees interested"	7
"Decision made elsewhere"	7
"Didn't know where to go for help"	5
"Doubt benefit of such programs"	5
"Never gave matter much thought"	4
"Cost is too high"	4
"Good salary and pension..enough"	4
"Doubt benefit to employee"	4
"Employees feel this is private matter"	2
"Unaware of such programs elsewhere"	2
"Have just neglected our responsibility"	2
"Doubt benefit to company"	2
"Not a company responsibility"	2
"Unions should be responsible"	1

TABLE 48

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AMONG MANUFACTURERS  
(1000 AND OVER EMPLOYEES) OF REASONS  
FOR NOT ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT  
PROGRAMS

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	11
"No trained staff available"	9
"Matter of priorities....."	8
"Decision made elsewhere..."	4
"Too much time involved"	4
"Doubt benefit of such programs"	4
"No real reason"	4

TABLE 49

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AMONG MANUFACTURERS  
(500-1000 EMPLOYEES) OF REASONS FOR NOT  
ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	13
"Employee force generally young"	6
"No trained staff available"	6
"Firm too small"	5
"Matter of priorities....."	5
"Important...never got around to it"	5

TABLE 50

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AMONG MANUFACTURERS  
(250-500 EMPLOYEES) OF REASONS FOR NOT  
ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	16
"Employee force generally young"	7
"No trained staff available"	7
"Firm too small"	6
"Matter of priorities....."	4
"Thought about...uncertain how to..."	4

TABLE 51

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION AMONG NON-MANUFACTURERS OF REASONS  
FOR NOT ESTABLISHING PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

	<u>Frequency</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	45
"No trained staff available"	20
"Matter of priorities"	19
"Employee force generally young"	16
"Firm too small"	15
"Important...never got around to it"	12
"Never gave matter much thought"	9
"Too much time involved"	7
"Don't believe employees interested"	7
"No real reason"	6
"Thought about...uncertain how to"	6
"Cost is too high"	5
"Employees feel this is private matter"	5
"Unaware of such programs elsewhere"	5
"Company policy not to interfere"	5
"Decision made elsewhere"	3
"Didn't know where to go for help"	3
"Good salary and pension...enough"	3
"Have just neglected our responsibility"	3
"Doubt benefit to employee"	2
"Doubt benefit to company"	2
"Unions should be responsible"	2
"Doubt benefit of such programs"	1
"Not a company responsibility"	1
"Afraid unions would object"	1
"Other"	15

TABLE 52

MAJOR REASONS FOR NOT ESTABLISHING  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS RANKED BY  
ALL RESPONDENTS

	Rank Order	
"Too few employees retiring"	49	(25)
"Matter of priorities ....."	17	(8)
"Decision made ..... elsewhere"	10	(7)
"Important ... never got around to it"	10	(4)
"Firm too small"	8	(3)
"Never ... gave the matter much thought"	5	(1)
"No real reason ....."	5	(4)
"Employee force generally young"	5	(3)
"No trained staff available"	5	(3)
"Cost is too high"	3	(2)
"Thought about ... uncertain how to ....."	3	(2)
"Good salary and pension ... enough"	2	(2)
"Unaware of such programs elsewhere"	2	(-)
"Doubt benefit of such programs"	1	(1)
"Doubt benefit ..... to employee"	1	(1)
"Company policy not to interfere ....."	1	(-)
"Don't believe employees ... interested"	1	(-)
"Have just neglected our responsibility"	1	(1)
"Other"	17	(8)

Nos. 2, 8-9, 11-13, 15, 20-21, 24 and 28 were not cited.

( ) Number of manufacturers

TABLE 53

MAJOR REASONS FOR NOT ESTABLISHING  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS RANKED BY  
ALL MANUFACTURERS

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	25
"Matter of priorities ....."	8
"Decision made ..... elsewhere"	7
"Important ... never got around to it"	4
"No real reason ....."	4
"Firm too small"	3
"Employee force generally young"	3
"No trained staff available"	3
"Cost is too high"	2
"Thought about ... uncertain how to ... "	2
"Good salary and pension ... enough"	2
"Never ... gave the matter much thought"	1
"Doubt benefit of such programs"	1
"Doubt benefit ..... to employee"	1
"Have just neglected our responsibility"	1
"Other"	30

Nos. 2, 8-9, 11-13, 15, 18-21, 24 and 28 were not cited.

TABLE 54

MAJOR REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS RANKED  
BY MANUFACTURERS (1000 & over employees)

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	6
"Matter of priorities....."	6
"Decision made elsewhere..."	4

TABLE 55

MAJOR REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS RANKED  
BY MANUFACTURERS (500-1000 employees)

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	9
"Important...never got around to it"	2

TABLE 56

MAJOR REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS RANKED  
BY MANUFACTURERS (250-500 employees)

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	8
"Decision made elsewhere..."	3
"Firm too small"	2
"Good salary and pension...enough"	2

TABLE 57

MAJOR REASONS FOR NOT ESTABLISHING  
PRE-RETIREMENT PROGRAMS RANKED BY  
ALL NON-MANUFACTURERS

	<u>Rank Order</u>
"Too few employees retiring"	24
"Matter of priorities ....."	9
"Important .... never got around to it"	6
"Firm too small"	5
"Never ..... gave the matter much thought"	4
"Decision made ..... elsewhere"	3
"Employee force generally young"	2
"No trained staff available"	2
"Unaware of such programs elsewhere"	2
"No real reason ....."	1
"Cost is too high"	1
"Thought about ... uncertain how to ....."	1
"Company policy not to interfere ....."	1
"Don't believe employees ..... interested"	1
"Other"	9

Nos. 2, 8-16, 20-21, 24, 28 and 29 were not cited.



## APPENDIX B

DIVISION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
CITY OF CHICAGO

## RETIREMENT PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of firm \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of employees \_\_\_\_\_  
Average number of employees retiring each year \_\_\_\_\_

YES NO

- I. Is retirement compulsory at your firm? \_\_\_\_\_
- A. If yes, compulsory at what age? \_\_\_\_\_
- B. If no, what is the average age at which an employee retires? \_\_\_\_\_
- II. Do you have a pre-retirement planning or counseling program for your employees? \_\_\_\_\_
- A. If no, would you be interested in establishing such a program? \_\_\_\_\_
- B. If you have a program, please answer the following questions in this section.
1. How long have you had this program?  
\_\_\_\_\_ years
2. Who conducts the program?  
a. \_\_\_\_\_ Personnel Department  
b. \_\_\_\_\_ Industrial Relations Department  
c. \_\_\_\_\_ Employee Benefits Department  
d. \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Where applicable, to what extent are labor representatives involved in the program?  
a. \_\_\_\_\_ Planning  
b. \_\_\_\_\_ Conducting  
c. \_\_\_\_\_ Encouraging employee participation  
d. \_\_\_\_\_ Not directly involved
4. Do you employ a retirement planning director or counselor? \_\_\_\_\_  
a. \_\_\_\_\_ Full-time  
b. \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time
5. Is participation in the program compulsory? \_\_\_\_\_  
If voluntary, estimate percent participating \_\_\_\_\_%
6. Is employee's spouse encouraged to participate? \_\_\_\_\_  
If yes, estimate percent participating \_\_\_\_\_%

# APPENDIX B

## RETIREMENT PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE Page 2.

YES NO

7. How is your program scheduled?
  - a. ☐ Company time
  - b. ☐ Employee time
  - c. ☐ Company and employee time
8. At what age do you initiate retirement planning contacts with each employee?
9. Indicate age group your program is primarily designed to reach.
  - a. ☐ 49 and under
  - b. ☐ 50 - 54
  - c. ☐ 55 - 59
  - d. ☐ 60 - 64
  - e. ☐ 65 and over
10. Indicate method(s) used in conducting your program.
  - a. ☐ Individual counseling
    - (1) How many interviews prior to retirement?
    - (2) Are the interviews regularly scheduled?
  - b. ☐ Group meetings
    - (1) Average size of each group
    - (2) Average number of times each group meets
  - c. ☐ Home study
  - d. ☐ Mailings
11. Which of the above methods, if you use more than one, is your primary approach?
12. Considering all possible methods used, indicate average number of pre-retirement planning contacts with each employee.
13. What topics are specifically scheduled for coverage in your program?
 

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Finances	i. <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteer services
b. <input type="checkbox"/> Use of time	j. <input type="checkbox"/> Interpersonal
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health	relationships
d. <input type="checkbox"/> Physical health	k. <input type="checkbox"/> Adult education
e. <input type="checkbox"/> Legal matters	l. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
f. <input type="checkbox"/> Housing	<input type="text"/>
g. <input type="checkbox"/> Travel	<input type="text"/>
h. <input type="checkbox"/> Hobbies	<input type="text"/>
14. What is the primary topic covered?
15. Do you use textual materials related to the above topics?
16. Do you use the Division's pre-retirement planning materials in your program? 
  - a. ☐ Film, "The Rest of Your Life"
  - b. ☐ Booklet, "Are you Planning on Living the Rest of Your Life?"

# APPENDIX B

-95-

## RETIREMENT PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE Page 3.

YES NO

III. Do you make a special effort to continue a relationship with your retired employees?

\_\_\_\_

A. Indicate what efforts you make.

1. ☐ Furnishing a subscription to a period-  
ical for retired persons
2. ☐ Mailing the house organ
3. ☐ Planning special events
4. ☐ Writing occasional letters
5. ☐ Encouraging the retiree to return for  
a visit
6. ☐ Making personal visits to the retiree
7. ☐ Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

B. Indicate special services provided for retired employees.

1. ☐ Counseling
2. ☐ Medical
3. ☐ Insurance
4. ☐ Educational
5. ☐ Recreational
6. ☐ Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

C. Do you have a senior citizens' or retirees' club?

1. Does this group meet on a regular basis? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Average number of meetings per year. \_\_\_\_\_

Comments (use the reverse side if you wish) upon the success of your program, its special features, particular problems, materials used, etc.

Would you be willing to assist us in additional research? ( ) Yes ( ) No

By \_\_\_\_\_

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

# APPENDIX C

DIVISION FOR SENIOR CITIZENS  
640 North LaSalle

Tel. 744-4016

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
Chicago, Illinois 60610

## RETIREMENT PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE

*This research instrument is being used to study various reasons why retirement planning programs have not been offered previously. Indicate as many reasons as apply to your firm. You may, if you wish, sign the form. However, this will not be necessary since a code number appears at the bottom to identify your firm and its particular category. Please return the completed questionnaire by December 15th. All replies will be kept in strictest confidence.*

Our firm does not offer a pre-retirement planning or counseling program for its employees for the following reason or reasons:

- ☐ 1. Decision made at corporate office elsewhere
- ☐ 2. Opposition from top management
- ☐ 3. Too few employees retiring
- ☐ 4. Firm too small
- ☐ 5. Employee force generally young
- ☐ 6. Cost is too high
- ☐ 7. No trained staff available
- ☐ 8. Too much time involved
- ☐ 9. Not a company responsibility
- ☐ 10. Good salary and pension plan are enough
- ☐ 11. Afraid unions would object
- ☐ 12. Lack of cooperation from unions
- ☐ 13. Unions should be responsible for such programs
- ☐ 14. Doubt benefit of such programs
- ☐ 15. Doubt benefit of such programs to company
- ☐ 16. Doubt benefit of such programs to employee
- ☐ 17. Matter of priorities - other things more important
- ☐ 18. Company policy not to interfere in employee's private life
- ☐ 19. Don't believe employee's would be interested
- ☐ 20. If it's important, let employee do it
- ☐ 21. Employees feel this is private matter
- ☐ 22. Unaware of such programs elsewhere
- ☐ 23. Thought about it but uncertain how to begin
- ☐ 24. Didn't know where to go for help in starting program
- ☐ 25. Never really gave the matter much thought
- ☐ 26. No real reason - just haven't done anything
- ☐ 27. Important but just never got around to it
- ☐ 28. Just not interested
- ☐ 29. Have just neglected our responsibility
- ☐ 30. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

If you have indicated more than one reason, please rank the first, second and third major reasons by listing the appropriate number (using the above scale) in the spaces below:

1st reason \_\_\_\_\_  
2nd reason \_\_\_\_\_  
3rd reason \_\_\_\_\_

## STATEMENT OF CRITERIA

Considerable experience has been gained by management and labor, by universities, by other community agencies, and all organizations or institutions that have been experimenting with pre-retirement planning. Such programs have typically been directed toward group and/or toward individuals.

Review of these programs reveals that although there are many variations the methodology and content of a good program is taking shape and definition. A good pre-retirement education program may be outlined as follows:

### A. Approach

Employees should be encouraged to begin planning for retirement a minimum of five years, preferably more, prior to the actual retirement date. Participation should be on a voluntary basis and should include the worker's spouse. Management and labor representatives should be involved in planning, promoting and conducting the program.

### B. Method

Six to eleven (or more as need indicates) discussion sessions for groups numbering 20 or less employees should be scheduled periodically during the year, depending upon the total number of employees approaching retirement. Group sessions should be conducted by persons trained in pre-retirement planning and in group leadership techniques. In addition, individual counseling should be available to the employee as well. Regular mailing of booklets, pamphlets, etc. covering subjects pertinent to retirement planning and to retirement per se represent another important educational and supportive technique.

## APPENDIX D

### STATEMENT OF CRITERIA

Page 2.

#### C. Subject Matter

Key topics which should be covered in the program are (1) financial planning; (2) leisure and work; (3) living arrangements; (4) physical health; (5) mental health and (6) interpersonal relationships. These topics expanded would include use of time, legal matters, travel, volunteer service and adult education.

#### D. Materials

Movies, film strips, pictures, flip charts and other attractive audio visual materials should be incorporated into the group presentations. A basic book or series of books serves as a frame of reference and textual organization of the training program. Each participant should be furnished with a guidebook for personal retirement planning.

#### E. Follow-up

After retirement, the employer can maintain contact with the retiree by furnishing a subscription to a periodical for retired person, mailing the house organ, planning special events, writing occasional letters, encouraging the retiree to return for a visit and making personal visits to the retiree. Where possible, a retirees' club with structured activities should be established.



APPENDIX E -

Excerpt from "Response to the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual, U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, on the Question of 'The Federal Role in Encouraging Pre-Retirement Training and New Work-Lifetime Patterns'", Division for Senior Citizens, Department of Human Resources, City of Chicago, August, 1969.

"All organized employee-employer concerns -- whether government, business, industry or labor -- have individuals and groups of individuals with particular responsibility for personnel, general administration, policy decisions, production, quality control, etc. The same ought no less to be true for retirement counseling."

"Too often, in our experience, retirement counseling is either an added responsibility given to an already over-burdened staff member or is essentially forgotten altogether except for token efforts. If employment, recruitment and training are considered particular areas of expertise, as all would agree they are, management cannot afford to consider retirement counseling as requiring any less degree of personnel staffing and professional expertise. All knowledgeable in the field of retirement preparation agree to its importance. However, of the more than 250 clients presently served by the Division, none employs a full-time retirement counselor and less than ten percent have professional staff persons who are able to devote at least fifty percent of their time to retirement counseling. The majority of the persons actually conducting these programs agree themselves to the need for full-time staff personnel. A full-time retirement counselor is also an essential need if the employer hopes to coordinate a pre-retirement planning program with a later post-retirement program."

ERIC Clearinghouse

OCT 7 1971

on Adult Education